



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

tratt. 4 (part of *La filosofia morale*). Sir Thomas North did not translate this part of Doni's work. See *The Morall Philosophie of Doni*, 1570.

Redaction by Hans Sachs from Germ. trans. Nürnberg ed. 4, 3, 54.

*Arabian Nights*, trans. Weil III, p. 910.

*Cabinet des fées* XVIII, 36.

Kirchhof, *Wendunmuth*, no. 171, ed. Oesterley, 1869, I, pp. 205, 206.

*Iyar-i-Danish*, from *Anvar*, trans. Chambers and Jones, *Asiatic Miscellany*, 1787, p. 69.

*Exemplario contra los engaños y peligros del mundo*, 1493, from John of Capua.

Firenzuola, *Discorsi degli animali*, 1548.

J. Hulsbusch, *Sylva sermonum*, 1568, 28 and 287.

Gast, *Convivialium sermonum*, 1549. I cannot find it in the ed. of 1561.

Mart. Montanus, *Gartengesellschaft*, 1590, cap. 55, ed. Bolte, *Schwankbücher*, 1899, p. 303.

Sebastian Franck, *Sprichwörter*, 1541, I, 148, II, 50. I cannot find the reference in Guttenstein's ed. 1831.

*Zeitvertreiber*, 1668, pp. 466, 469.

*Peregrination oder Reyse-Spiegel aus Anangkylom- itens Reise-Beschreibung*, 1631, p. 28.

*Cento nov. ant.* 29, Oesterley's reference. It does not appear in Biagi, *Le novelle antiche*, 1880.

Giovanni Fiorentino, *Il Pecorone* II, 22. Not in the ed. of 1793.

*Einer reicher Vorrath artlicher Ergötzlichkeiten*, 1702, 134.

M. S. H. Stokes, *Indian Fairy Tales*, 1880, p. 31. A form evidently derived from the *Pantchatantra*.

Saadi (?). Liebrecht's note. It is not in the *Gulistan*.

GORDON HALL GEROULD.

*Bryn Mawr College.*

## VIEWS OF TRAGEDY AMONG THE EARLY GERMAN ROMANTICISTS. II.

The gulf between A. W. Schlegel's notions of tragedy proper and his views on ancient and modern tragedy in general is hardly wider than that between the latter and his conceptions of

individual tragedies. His characterization of Greek mythology,<sup>39</sup> which is that of Fr. Schlegel, refers hardly to the idea of fate. Aeschylus<sup>40</sup> is conceived much more as the poet of heroic passion, than of the power of fate. He criticizes Euripides<sup>41</sup> chiefly because he lacks unity and fails to portray the heroic. Only the *Eumenides* are wholly placed under the control of fate. *Agamemnon*<sup>42</sup> is described as the representation of a fall, ending in the triumph of a criminal woman who is called the chief character of the play; in the discussion of this work much more is said about atrocities committed than about fate. The idea of fate is hardly more referred to in the examination of *Prometheus Bound*,<sup>43</sup> which is influenced by several preconceived general notions. A. W. Schlegel sees<sup>44</sup> the special distinctions of the four tragedies of Sophocles *Antigone*, *Ajax*, *Electra* and *Oedipus on Kolonos*, in the representation of purest womanhood, of manly sense of honor, of energy and pathos, and of mildest emotion and grace. In each case, therefore, the characteristic is a different one, and the critic expressly states that these four tragedies excel, each, by special distinctions.

To A. W. Schlegel the Moderns are represented chiefly by Shakespeare and the Spanish poets. Shakespeare is the great painter of character, of passion and of environment; in harmony with this are the explanations of his tragedies: *Romeo and Julia*<sup>45</sup> is the picture of love and its fatal destiny in the world; *Othello*<sup>46</sup> deals chiefly with the victory of passion over the nobler instincts in human nature; *Hamlet*<sup>47</sup> represents human life as a mystery and tends to show how reflection checks energy; *Macbeth*<sup>48</sup> is the gloomiest drama since the *Furies* of Aeschylus, describing the fall of an ambitious but heroic man; it is dominated not so much by the ancient idea of fate as by the modern notion of providence<sup>49</sup>; *Lear*<sup>50</sup> evokes

<sup>39</sup> *Ib.*, v, 79 ff.

<sup>40</sup> *Ib.*, v, 89 ff.

<sup>41</sup> *Ib.*, v, 136 ff.

<sup>42</sup> *Ib.*, v, 94 ff.

<sup>43</sup> *Ib.*, v, 108 ff.

<sup>44</sup> *Ib.*, v, 117. The expression used by him is, *Eigentümliche Vorzüge*; probably = essence.

<sup>45</sup> *Ib.*, vi, 242.

<sup>46</sup> *Ib.*, vi, 244 ff.

<sup>47</sup> *Ib.*, vi, 247 ff.

<sup>48</sup> *Ib.*, vi, 253.

<sup>49</sup> A. W. Schlegel's view on the relation of fate to providence varies.

<sup>50</sup> *Ib.*, vi, 259 ff.

pity; *Richard III*<sup>51</sup> centers about the diabolic figure of the king. These examples show clearly that to A. W. Schlegel Shakespeare's tragedies have not much more in common than their form; in one case he even goes as far as to mention<sup>52</sup> that Shakespeare's historical dramas excel, each, by special distinctions. The Spanish poets are conceived as the painters of religion, heroism, honor and love<sup>53</sup>; Cervantes' *Numancia*, however, is classified with the ancient type of tragedy on account of its chief characteristics, fatalism, chorus and the representation of heroism.<sup>54</sup>

There can be no doubt, it seems to me, that A. W. Schlegel's views on tragedy proper and on the Ancients and Moderns in general have not been based on his particular analyzations.<sup>55</sup> His strength lies in the latter; they properly represent his ideas. His definition of ancient tragedy was conventional; that of Aeschylus and Sophocles was taken over from Fr. Schlegel. The conception of Greek tragedy again furnished the third definition of tragedy proper. Of the two others the second is Kantian, while the first may be considered as A. W. Schlegel's own creation, derived probably from the conception of Romantic poetry as the expression of a dissatisfied mind. Now and then the idea is expressed<sup>56</sup> that the method of A. W. Schlegel's lectures is wholly historical. This view, it seems, is rather incorrect. The critic not only approaches his subject with preconceived general notions, but also emphasizes<sup>57</sup> the value of theory for the understanding of literary productions; moreover in the analysis of particular works he allows himself to be influenced by his theories. Kant, for instance, is, in part, responsible for the explanation of *Prometheus Bound*, and likewise A. W. Schlegel's tendency toward symbolism, in part, for the conception of ancient mythology and the *Eumenides*.

Friedrich Schlegel's views on tragedy in his

Vienna lectures<sup>58</sup> throw, in the first place, a light upon the somewhat vague treatment of the subject in his early writings. The connecting of Greek mythology and of Aeschylus with the representation of heroism is now much more definite than before. The former conception of Sophocles reappears, while more stress is placed on the significance of the chorus in Greek tragedy. What is new, however, in these lectures, is a methodical examination of the tragic in which incidental and undeveloped remarks of A. W. Schlegel receive a definite, systematic form.

Already A. W. Schlegel made incidentally the remark<sup>59</sup> that a sad ending is not necessary for tragedy; he referred to the *Eumenides*, *Philoctet* and *Oedipus on Kolonos*. He also pointed to the mild emotion at the end of Voltaire's *Tancred*,<sup>60</sup> to the solution of the problems of life in *Lear*,<sup>61</sup> and to the appearance of a superintendent providence as an important element of tragedy.<sup>62</sup> This is condensed to a system by Fr. Schlegel. He now sees the object of tragedy in the portrayal of the deeper meaning of human life. The development of a tragedy is to him not more important than its end, and in taking this position he obtains the basis for subdividing tragedy proper into the tragedy of *Untergang*, *Versöhnung* und *Verklärung*. In the first the tragic hero perishes; the second ends half sorrowfully in a feeling of mingled satisfaction and peace; the third ends in the purification of the soul obtained by the interference of providence. The Ancients inclined decidedly toward the first kind, in accordance with their idea of a terrible, determining fate; but among them are found also splendid examples of the second and even advances toward the third kind of tragedy. As to the Moderns, the first type is exemplified by *Wallenstein*, *Macbeth* and the Faust legend. Shakespeare is the most prominent poet of the second type, while the third is classically represented by the Spanish drama.

These are the outlines of a conception of tragedy which may be called specifically Romantic.

<sup>51</sup> *Ib.*, VI, 298.

<sup>52</sup> *Ib.*, VI, 263.

<sup>53</sup> *Ib.*, VI, 392.

<sup>54</sup> *Ib.*, VI, 379.

<sup>55</sup> His first definition may be in a certain harmony with his conception of *Prometheus Bound* and *Othello*.

<sup>56</sup> So concerning his Berlin lectures by E. Sulger-Gebing, *Die Brüder A. W. u. F. Schlegel i. ihr. Verh. z. d. bild. Kunst*, 1896, 50 ff.

<sup>57</sup> *Deu. Litt. D.*, etc., 17. vol., 3, 9, 26 ff.

<sup>58</sup> *Sämmtl. Werke*, Wien, 1846, I, 30 ff.; II, 84 ff.

<sup>59</sup> *Sämmtl. Werke*, v, 73.

<sup>60</sup> *Ib.*, VI, 101.

<sup>61</sup> *Ib.*, VI, 263.

<sup>62</sup> *Ib.*, v, 75.

The views of Tieck on the subject in question are, on the whole, not influenced in any material way by either Fr. or A. W. Schlegel. His writings contain only two attempts to define tragedy. The second<sup>63</sup> of them even hardly deserves this name. The first<sup>64</sup> is somewhat more definite; it identifies the essence of tragedy with the representation of passion, its aim with the evoking of fear and pity. However, these conventional definitions fail to express adequately the views which Tieck held at that time. In analyzing Shakespeare's tragedies, Tieck mentions in only three places<sup>65</sup> pity as being the tragic effect; in all other places<sup>66</sup> he points to fear. Less harmonious are the ideas concerning the tragic effect which may be derived from Tieck's literary reviews of later date. Tieck does not wholly abandon the idea that the spectator must be stirred to fear by tragedy<sup>67</sup>; but he now sees the tragic effect more in the feeling of admiration<sup>68</sup> or of peace.<sup>69</sup> Even more chaotic, it must be assumed, were then Tieck's views on the essence of tragedy. It is not even clear in what Tieck sees the characteristics of his idol, Shakespeare. Is it the form of his tragedies, or the portrayal of characters and passion, or irony? *Othello* (IV, 223), *Tasso* (IV, 257) and *Wallenstein* (III, 49) are called wonderful *Seelengemälde*. On the other hand, *Lear* (III, 226 ff.) and the career of the historical Anne Boleyn are conceived as tragedies of misfortune and the life of the latter is considered a very good subject for tragedy. In the later *Unterhaltungen mit Tieck*,<sup>70</sup> the *Räuber* are highly praised on account of the gigantic figure of Franz Moor (193 ff.), and likewise *Goetz von Berlichingen* on account of the vigor and life pervading it. Still it is not the portrayal of passion but the downfall of the man which at bottom makes the figure of Franz appeal most strongly to Tieck. Furthermore, Tieck does not fail to refer with apparent satisfaction to a spirit of reconciliation running

through the drama. This spirit, he finds, is pronounced everywhere.

It can safely be said that the mature Tieck had no definite conception of tragedy aside from the fact that he considered Shakespeare as its highest possible representative. On the other hand, it is probable that to him *Lear* was the highest type of the tragic hero. His conception of this character is not always the same; but if we are allowed to consider Tieck's critical reviews of 1820-25 as the æsthetic programme of his later years, then we may infer that to him Shakespeare's *Lear* in particular and Shakespeare's tragedies in general are tragedies of misfortune.

It is obvious that Tieck's views on tragedy have on the whole little in common with those of the two Schlegels. Only in one point he fully agrees with them, in the position he gives to guilt in tragedy. In R. Köpke, *L. Tieck*, II, 235, *Kr. Schr.*, III, 19 ff., 51, 226, guilt is treated as being of decidedly little importance to tragedy; *Kr. Schr.*, III, 49, even show a predilection for the guiltless tragic hero. A connecting of the downfall with guilt is generally absent. Fr. Schlegel accepts guilt in tragedy reservedly in his letters to his brother, 118; he rejects it absolutely in his early writings, I, 158. A. W. Schlegel does not favor a mechanical distribution of reward and punishment at the end of a drama (*Deu. Litt. D.*, etc., 19. vol., 123). But he also dislikes that the wicked should remain absolutely unpunished (*Sämmtl. Werke*, VI, 298-99), and prefers the immanent rewarding of the good and the punishment of the bad (*ib.*, VI, 263, 299).

PAUL REIFF.

Washington University.

## MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

### I.

#### ANGLO-SAXON *Chronicle*, 897.

There is one passage in the interesting but somewhat complicated account of the naval engagement between the West-Saxons and the Danes off the Isle of Wight, given in the *Chroni-*

<sup>63</sup> R. Köpke, *L. Tieck*, II, 235.

<sup>64</sup> *Krit. Schr.*, I, 62.

<sup>65</sup> *Kr. Schr.*, I, 32, 52, 62.

<sup>66</sup> *ib.*, I, 5, 39, 41, 58, 65, etc.

<sup>67</sup> *Kr. Schr.*, I, 297, 302. III, 47, 74.

<sup>68</sup> *ib.*, III, 49.

<sup>69</sup> *ib.*, III, 23, 43.

<sup>70</sup> R. Köpke, etc., II.